DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 147 SP 031 219

AUTHOR Brookhart, Susan M.; Loadman, William E.
TITLE School-University Collaboration: Why It's Multicultural Education.
PUB DATE 27 Mar 89
NOTE 36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Human Relations; Institutional Characteristics; *Organizational Climate; Perspective Taking; *Professional Recognition; *Social Systems; *Sociocultural Patterns; *Teacher Attitudes; Theory Practice Relationship; *Work Environment

ABSTRACT

Collaboration between university and public school educators is a strategy which has recently gained support as a part of the teacher education process and as a viable area in which to conduct research. This paper defines the concept of the culture of educational settings and asserts that school-university collaboration occurs in the intersection of two cultures. The sense a person makes out of life and work at a university differs in four dimensions from the sense a person makes out of life and work in a public school: (1) work tempo and the nature of professional time; (2) professional focus, from theoretical to practical; (3) career reward structures; and (4) sense of personal power and efficacy, or the connection one perceives between one's educational efforts and intended outcomes. Descriptions and evaluations of various collaborative projects are reviewed, along with related literature. Evidence is cited to support the findings that educators who have participated in collaboration gain insights into the nature of their own and fellow educators' orientations with respect to the cited dimensions. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED308147

SCHOOL-UNIVERSITY COLLABORATION: WHY IT'S MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

Susan M. Brookhart

William E. Loadman

College of Education

The Ohio State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Brookhart

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Presented at the Annual Meeting of the

American Educational Research Association

San Francisco, California

March 27, 1989

3/02/19

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SCHOOL-UNIVERSITY COLLABORATION:

WHY IT'S MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

Abstract: Collaboration between university and public school educators is a strategy which has recently gained support as a part of the teacher education process and as a viable area in which to conduct research. This paper defines the concept of the culture of educational settings and asserts that school-university collaboration occurs in the intersection of two cultures. Descriptions and evaluations of various collaborative projects are reviewed, along with related literature. Four dimensions of the culture of educational settings are important in descriptions of the nature of collaborative work. The dimensions are as follows: (1) work tempo and the nature of professional time, (2) professional focus, from theoretical to practical, (3) career reward structure, and (4) sense of personal power and efficacy. Evidence is cited to support that educators who have participated in collaboration gain insights into the nature of their own and fellow educators' orientations with respect to these dimensions.

SCHOOL-UNIVERSITY COLLABORATION:

WHY IT'S MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

Universities and public schools share the same overarching goal of furthering people's learning, but they have two different cultures (Sarason, 1982). In order for meaningful communication to occur between them, participants in school-university collaboration must understand the perspectives of both university and public school educators (Gifford & Gabelko, 1987). Such "cross-cultural" understanding is more important for the second wave of reforms proposed in the middle and later 1980's than ever before.

Increasing the amount and quality of school-university collaboration promises to be a way for educators to pursue important goals with integrity between means and ends. Goals like better educational inquiry and higher standards for professional teacher preparation are consistent with methods which actively involve both university and public school educators, since research and professional practice bear directly on what goes on in both kinds of institutions. Recently proposed educational reforms call for schools and universities to interact at a deeper level than they currently do.

The purpose of this paper is to assert that two cultures do indeed interact in the conduct of collaborative school-university programs. Since this is so, it is instructive to describe and understand some of the cultural forms or shared frames of reference which characterize the two settings. This paper will therefore review literature about schools and universities and about their working together. Four dimensions,

perspectives, or themes underlie this literature. These four dimensions serve as organizing principles for much of what has been written about what it is like to work in universities and public schools. The sense a person makes out of life and work at a university differs, at least from these four perspectives, from the sense a person makes out of life and work in a public school. The dimensions, defined in more detail below, are as follows: (1) work tempo and the nature of professional time, (2) professional focus, from theoretical to practical, (3) career reward structure, or what is rewarding in one's educational setting, and (4) sense of personal power and efficacy, or the connection one perceives between one's educational efforts and intended outcomes.

Three kinds of introductions will set the stage for the presentation of evidence for four dimensions of culture in educational settings. First, educational reform as a topic in current events is reviewed briefly. The treatment here will be brief because so much has been written elsewhere on this topic, but it must be mentioned because educational reform proposals calling for more school-university collaboration were the reason for this look at the literature in the first place. Second, the definition or theory of culture which the authors of this paper use is set forth. This section thus examines the theoretical framework into which the four dimensions and relevant literature are fit. Third, school-university collaboration is defined for the purpose of this paper, and a review of the treatment of the concept in the writings of others is given.

Educational reform, educational cultures, and school-university collaboration were the three key concepts the authors held in mind as they reviewed and synthesized the literature. The four dimensions are

constructs discovered in the literature. These four dimensions are not new concepts, but to the authors' knowledge they have not previously been identified, labeled, and discussed with respect to the intercultural nature of school-university collaboration.

Educational Reform in the 1980's

Goodlad (1984, p. 57) referred to what he has called the "education gap: 'the distance between man's most noble visions of what he might become and present levels of functioning.'" In the first part of the 1980's, states passed legislation about teacher certification, competency testing, and accountability which has been called the first wave of the educational reform movement of the 1980's. These legislative changes happened at the same time as the public and the educational community were reading the National Commission on Excellence in Education's A Nation at Risk (1983). What is needed, it said, is for American education to be the best in the world. Settle for nothing less; perseverance can make it happen. The report cited declining test scores, illiteracy rates, and "cafeteria-style" curricula as evidence for a declining trend in the quality of American education, "a trend that stems more from weakness of purpose, confusion of vision, underuse of talent, and lack of leadership, than from conditions beyond our control" (p. 15). If this were the problem, the first wave of 80's reforms was to be the solution: a workout program for flabby thinking muscles, with basic skills instead of push-ups.

The legislative changes slowed in the middle of the decade (Pipho, 1986). But the atmosphere of discontent with the educational system persisted. A second wave of educational reform proposals, much more

sophisticated than the first, called for changes in an interconnected set of institutions. The Holmes Group report concentrated not on the shortcomings of student achievement but on the shortcomings of teacher preparation institutions and the teaching profession they feed (Holmes Group, 1986). The Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession used an economic argument to arrive at similar suggestions (Carnegie Forum, 1986). Goodlad's study A Place Called School (1984) called for changes in the structure and content of schooling. State governors drafted a plan of their own, Time for Results (1986). There were other reports, too.

Urging educational reform is not new in this country. Since the last century, American education has been taken to task for not accomplishing those noble ideals to which Goodlad referred. John Dewey established his laboratory school at the University of Chicago before the turn of the century. Henry Holmes worked on changing teacher education at Harvard University in the 1920's. In the 1950's, the launch of Sputnik prompted the introduction of the New Math and national legislation to put money into educational research and program development. The ten years after the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 were so busy with programs and changes that they were dubbed the "decade of reform."

What is interesting about the second wave of the eighties reform proposals is that they take seriously the interconnectedness of the public schools, institutions of higher education, and the community at large. In the vocabulary of this paper, then, they recognize that intercultural understanding is a prerequisite for implementing all these reforms, including increased school-university collaboration. The next section of this paper will describe this use of the concept of culture, the thoughts and actions with which people ascribe meaning to their experiences and

within which they construe their own and others' conversations and activities.

Culture

No one would argue that universities and public schools are both institutions within a larger "culture" in this country. Some have, however, argued that the persons within these institutions share enough specific interpretations of words and actions that the concept of culture is not too large or too strong to accurately suggest the nature of these frames of reference (Sarason, 1982). This reasoning works to explain, for example, why 50's-style "teacher-proof" curricula often failed to catch on in public schools. Ignoring or circumventing the classroom teacher makes sense only in a culture, like that of a university curriculum development lab, where the meaning associated with teacher is that of implementer of curriculum. In a culture where the teacher is the center of the mini-universe called a classroom, it makes no sense to ignore him or her (Sarason, 1982).

Culture is a concept from the field of anthropology. The work of anthropologist Clifford Geertz seems most useful for understanding the thinking of those in education who have pointed out that educational institutions have distinct cultures (see, for example, Sarason, 1982; Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986). Therefore it is Geertz's discussion of culture which is presented as a theoretical base for describing culture in educational settings.

For Geertz, culture is the framework which groups of people construct for themselves to make sense out of social discourse and social behavior. To illustrate, he used the example of a wink, which is only a meaningful

gesture in a cultural context. To the uninitiated, a wink is a mere eyelid contraction. Depending on the situation, a wink could be sly, communicating a conspiratorial message, or it could be mocking, as two communicators make fun of an unaware third person. A wink could be salacious, inviting a sexual response, or it could be playful, a harmless flirtation. One could even wink in front of a mirror, alone, to practice and perfect the gesture for use later! The point is that the behavior has meaning in context. This is only possible if one assumes a group of people, all of whom share at least a certain understanding of eyelid contractions (Geertz, 1973, pp. 5-7).

It is the collection of these certain understandings which Geertz defined as culture. His metaphor is eloquent: "Believing, with Max Weber, that man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning" (Geertz, 1973, p. 5).

Imbedded in this one sentence are three important points about what culture is. First, culture is public. It exists in the transfer of meaning, through either words or actions, between people. Second, there is a chicken-and-egg quality to the way in which behavior and beliefs are behind culture, forming it, and are also the consequences of culture, emerging from it. Third, the proper goal of cultural analysis is description, not prescription. Cultural anthropologists seek to understand the meanings inherent in social actions, not to predict or prescribe what those meanings or actions should be. These three points have implications for looking at educational institutions as well as civilizations, tribes, and nations, the more traditional subjects of

cultural analysis.

Culture is public; therefore, it can be studied. Studies of the cultures of educational settings all have in common description of the "web" of meanings within them. Mitchell, Ortiz, and Mitchell (1987) used the phrase "shared frames of reference" (p. 47). Studies of school cultures have not been primarily anthropological (Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986), but have used a variety of approaches and methods. Traditional methods of studying culture include various types of observations and interviews. The authors have adapted a traditional method of measuring attitudes, the summated rating scale, to tap shared frames of reference across institutions (Brookhart & Loadman, 1989).

The beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors shared by those in schools or in universities at once cause and are caused by the nature of life within the institution. To illustrate, a typical schoolteacher sees his or her own classroom and pupils as the central focus for emotional attachment as well as job performance (Lortie, 1975). This causes the teacher to spend most of his or her time, talent, and emotional energy on the classroom and the children. Because the teacher invests most of his or her energy in the classroom and the children, these become the main focus of and purpose for his or her daily activities. This degenerates into a circular argument if one applies logic to try to explain cause-and-effect relationships.

The perspective of Geertz's interpretive theory of culture helps to redefine the problem. The question is not "Which came first, the chicken or the egg?" but rather "How now, brown cow?" What is the situation? What is life like in a classroom? What interpretations do insiders give to various aspects of that life? This paper considers these questions for both school and university people.

The result of cultural analysis should be description, not prescription. The purpose of studying culture is to access the conceptual world of the subjects, because only then can one converse with them (Geertz, 1973). Advocating school-university collaboration assumes conversation is possible between school and university people (Buchmann, 1985). Committees can only plan together if the members understand one another when they talk. People with two different frames of reference within which to understand goals and strategies for meeting them will make slightly different sense out of the same proceedings. For example, at a planning session, a university professor might talk about a curriculum change taking "a long time" to implement. By this phrase, he or she might mean several years. A classroom teacher hearing the phrase might understand it to mean six or eight weeks. Miscommunication can occur where none was intended because of cultural differences.
School-university project committees can write their own prescriptions for particular actions if and only if those on each side of the hyphen comprehend one another.

Definitions of Collaboration

Collaboration, as the term is used in this paper, refers to projects in which university and public school educators work together. A fully collaborative project requires input from school and university people in setting project goals, carrying out project activities, and sharing in project benefits. It should be clear from the discussion of educational cultures that collaboration by definition occurs at a point of intersection between two different cultures. This paper identifies four salient dimensions of cultural differences between university and public

school educators. Before discussing these dimensions, however, the short definition of collaboration needs to be expanded and supported with a review of the definitions others have written.

Some things have changed a great deal since Houston wrote, eight years ago, "The title of this paper is the sole entry in the University of Houston's library card catalog when one searches the index for resources on collaboration" (Houston, 1980, p. 331). Collaboration has gained support as part of the teacher education process and as a viable area in which to conduct research. Houston noted a lack of research studies on collaboration, pointing instead to case studies of individual "conditions, designs, and dreams" (p. 333). There is still little systematic inquiry into collaboration. But many more descriptions, cases, and projects have made their way into print since such work began. Lieberman and Miller (1984) cited a Columbia University Teachers College effort as the first time they found school district personnel involved in collaborative research. In 1953, school people helped define a research problem and worked on it with university researchers; the process itself was a traditional research paradigm.

Schlechty and Whitford (1988) distinguished between cooperative, symbiotic, and organic collaboration. Cooperative collaboration is motivated by enlightened self-interest between individuals. A professor might ask a teacher friend to help with a research project, for example, in return for providing some classroom materials. Symbiotic collaboration involves institutions working together, each on its own agenda. For example, student teacher placement serves university educational goals while also providing university fee waivers for school district personnel. Organic collaboration, in which two institutions join together to set mutual goals, is more difficult. This is the kind of work that has

been receiving attention recently as a potential source of improvement for teacher education and staff development, as well as research, and it is similar to the definition of collaboration used in this paper.

Hord (1986) distinguished between mere cooperation and collaboration. She supported collaboration, in which both universities and public schools share in the planning, communication, and support process as well as the tasks and rewards of a project. She noted, however, that collaboration was more difficult than cooperation, the more traditional arrangement in which one organization gets the permission of another to accomplish its agenda.

In the mid 1970's, Tikunoff and Ward developed a model they called Interactive Research and Development on Teaching, IR&DT. They cited the weakness of the linear research-development-dissemination-implementation model, in which the teacher is a rather passive consumer of research and in which the four functions in the process are separated from one another, often by years (Tikunoff, Ward, & Griffin, 1979). They tested their IR&DT model with projects in San Diego and Vermont. The San Diego team investigated a research question about coping strategies for classroom distractions. The Vermont team investigated relationships between teacher mood and supportive instructional behavior.

Tikunoff and Ward (1983) listed six characterstics of fully collaborative research projects. First, the teacher is involved in the process of research. Second, problem definition stems from teacher concerns. Third, decisions are made jointly by teachers and researchers. Fourth, potential application of results is a major concern. Fifth, classroom instruction is maintained. Sixth, all participants, from both the university and the public school, experience professional growth.

Nur (1983) summarized such characteristics. Collaboration for research is a joint problem-solving process in which teachers and researchers work with "parity and equal responsibility" (p. 225). The equality between teachers and researchers to which Tikunoff and Ward or Nur referred is not sameness. The two groups work together precisely because each brings a skill or insight that illuminates what the other does. Each person contributes something different; the parity is equality of rights and responsibilities, not of tasks.

Preservice and inservice teacher education has been another area of interest in collaboration. Parkay (1986) described the nature of collaboration for staff development (inservice teacher education) in a prize-winning program in Southwest Texas. Glickman (1988) described the nature of optimal collaboration between university student teaching supervisors and their cooperating teachers. In each description, the teacher and university educator were equal partners. This involves considerable personal risk. It also invites considerable professional and personal growth as a result of the process.

Maeroff (1983) reviewed school and college partnerships of several types and noted it was ironic so little collaboration with joint planning was done in the area of teacher preparation. He considered this a logical area for joint efforts. In the instances where schools and university colleges of education did work together for teacher preparation, Maeroff saw five principles at work: (1) agreement about common problems, (2) equality of status for educators, (3) a sharp focus for the project, (4) recognition for participants, and (5) a focus on action and accomplishment, not structure and bureaucracy.

These definitions of collaboration are still more like Houston's

designs and dreams than like models or empirically validated constructs. There are two reasons for this: the relatively recent growth of interest in collaboration and the fact that collaboration is still "defining itself" as projects are happening. Empirical evidence that collaboration is a potent strategy and not merely reform rhetoric is just beginning to be available. Stallings and Martin (1988), for example, presented evidence that student teachers from the Houston Teaching Academy, a collaborative urban teacher-training program, improved teaching performance more than control group student teachers and were more likely to choose urban settings for employment.

All of these formulations of what is meant by "collaboration" refer to differences between working as a public school educator and a university educator, although they do not all use the term "culture" to refer to these frames of reference. Four dimensions of professional perceptions are important in descriptions of the nature of collaborative work and in literature about the cultures of the university and public school. The dimensions are as follows: (1) work tempo and the nature of professional time, (2) professional focus, from theoretical to practical, (3) career reward structure, or what is rewarding in one's educational setting, and (4) sense of personal power and efficacy, or the connection one perceives between one's educational efforts and intended outcomes. Educators who have participated in collaboration gain insights into the nature of their own and fellow educators' orientations with respect to these dimensions (Gifford, 1986).

There is evidence in reports about collaborative projects that perceptions in the university and school cultures differ with respect to these four dimensions. Increased understanding about the nature of these

dimensions has been reported as a primary result of participating in such projects. Goodlad (1988) and his associates have acknowledged the importance of communication and understanding to the success of school-university partnerships by creating the National Network (of School-University Partnerships) for Educational Renewal.

The four dimensions of the culture of educational settings, and evidence for them, are outlined below. The literature reviewed includes articles, conference papers, project reports, evaluations, and case studies, as well as more basic works on the nature of teaching. The literature includes descriptions of collaborative projects which differed in purpose, scope, and outcomes. Yet across these differences, the four dimensions of work tempo, professional focus, career reward structure, and sense of personal power and efficacy were clearly demonstrated as aspects of educators' work which collaboration emphasized.

Work Tempo

Sarason (1988) wrote that unrealistic expectations of the amount of time projects require in order to make real changes in schools are the biggest stumbling block to institutional change. Work time is perceived differently at the public school and the university. For teachers, there are certain constraints of time, the necessity to do more than one thing at one time, and a building hours and bell schedule definition of time. Public school administrators work on building-hour time, too, but they have some control over it. For university professors, there is the need for review and reflection and less emphasis on a daily routine and regimented schedules. These differences lead to different perceptions of how professional time is used.

A classic formulation of the perception of time for teachers is Lieberman and Miller's concept of "the dailiness of teaching" (Lieberman & Miller, 1979, 1984). The work life of a public school teacher includes many regularities, things that are constant. There are rhythms of days, weeks, and months. Time is limited. Time is also constrained to being spent in prescribed areas: the classroom, the hallway, the lunchroom (Lieberman & Miller, 1979, p. 57-58).

University faculty do not have the same constraints of time as Lieberman and Miller described for teachers. They certainly labor with time schedules, meetings, classes, and due dates, but their time is more likely to be organized by individual calendar than by community rhythms. Time at a university is driven, in general, by quarters or semesters and classes, but it is largely an individual affair, left to the management of the professor. He or she must keep office hours, but the choice of hours is at the professor's discretion. Classes meet, but not back to back and daily as in the public school.

Research and scholarly activity require time for reflection. It is true that teaching benefits from time for reflection, but it can be done, and often is, without it. Original thought, of the sort that is publishable in journals, cannot happen without it. Porter (1987) reviewed the effects of collaborative research at the Institute for Research on Teaching (IRT) at Michigan State University. The teacher collaborators at the IRT teach half-time in their schools and work as researchers on half-time release. They stay with IRT projects an average of three years. Porter quoted the writing of one teacher collaborator, who described the contrast in professional tempo between teaching and research (Porter, 1987, p. 148-149).

> When I joined the IRT, it was almost like entering a foreign culture. The contexts in which teachers and researchers work are dramatically different, and I was struck most by the difference in the tempo of daily life between the university and my school....The nature of the job encourages teachers to work at breakneck speed. We must confront, often simultaneously, a variety of concerns--those of students, administrators, and parents--that require our immediate attention....
>
> I retained this sense of immediacy when I began working at the IRT. On my first day, I walked quickly into the building and jogged up the stairs at my usual "teacher's clip." I raced toward the set of office cubicles that included mine and sat at my desk, poised for action, ready to respond to the needs of seven or eight people while simultaneously organizing my thoughts for whatever work I was to do...
>
> This work cannot be accomplished within the kind of lockstep schedule so essential at my school. At the IRT, I must adapt my schedule to my work instead of my work to my schedule. I find I need large blocks of uninterrupted time in which to think, discuss, and write about teaching if I am to do these things well.

This teacher, Robert Arndt, had discovered that the use of time for teachers and researchers is different, according to their different purposes. His writing also illustrates that collaboration between schools and universities does involve the intersection of two cultures, as Sarason commented. After exposure to the use of time in the researcher's culture, Arndt came to appreciate differences in tempo and time use between the two cultures.

Time is an important dimension in collaboration for teacher education as well as research. Sparks, Moody, and Johnson (1988) described a collaborative preservice field experience program between Eastern Michigan University and four local school districts. The availability of time for meetings, mentoring, and coaching and the restriction of teacher time was one major issue listed in the program review.

The Brackenridge Forum, a colloquy of Texas teachers, faculty from Trinity University, and several national leaders in education, also noted that time for working collaboratively was a real problem (Brackenridge Forum, 1988). Keating and Clark (1988), reporting on the Puget Sound

Educational Consortium, noted that time was more of a problem on the school district than on the university side.

The frames of reference or perspectives on work time, according to these sources, are different for university and public school educators. How fast is "fast"? How many things can one do at the same time? These questions are answered differently in different educational settings.

Professional Focus

A host of observations support the idea that professional educators perceive themselves differently with respect to the purpose of their work and their distance from the classroom. "Theory" and "practice" are two traditional names for the ends of a continuum in any field. In school work, the focus of one's educational efforts is partly a function of distance from the classroom. For the classroom teacher, the students and their moment-by-moment activities are concrete, perceivable through at least four of the five senses: sight, sound, smell, and touch. Sizer (1988) observed that there is a "dailiness" to the reality of public school administrators as well as classroom teachers.

No less real but at a different conceptual distance are researchable questions, preparation of lectures, and much of the rest of university professional practice. Somehow, the classroom work of university faculty, teaching graduates or undergraduates, does not have the same immediacy about it as the classroom work of public school teachers. This is probably because college students are adults, and the university teacher is primarily responsible for academic well-being, not lunches and coats or the student parking lot.

Heathington, Cagle, and George (1988) reported evidence for a gap

between theory and practice. They collected data about the objectives for collaboratively taught education courses and found that there were areas of difference as well as overlap in objectives for the same courses for university faculty and faculty associates, those cooperating teachers named as adjunct faculty.

Griffin (1983) pointed out that in the past, research has often been done <u>on</u> schools, using the classroom to suit the researcher's purpose without necessarily thinking about the classroom purposes, for example, changing curricula or time schedules. The results have been sometimes to create a dislike or distrust of research on the part of classroom teachers. Griffin saw this unfortunate consequence as a direct result of teachers and researchers not understanding their different perspectives.

There is a nasty side to this misunderstanding of perspectives that has resulted in harsh words. Examples are given here to illustrate what can happen when people with different perspectives assume their positions are correct and other positions must therefore be wrong. People who are busy exchanging harsh words or assuming they own the one correct point of view are prone to experiencing interpersonal conflict. This potential conflict will be heightened when dealing with the complicated business of educational collaboration.

The tradition of setting theory against practice, instead of setting them both together in a variety of educational contexts, has led to comments like Breinin's (1987, p. 16), who considers the teachers' professional perspective the real truth.

> Let me make a prediction. Sooner or later some smart graduate student (possibly funded by one of the teacher unions) is going to write a thesis on the shabbiness of most school administration, on the self-serving nature of many teachers of teachers, on the phoniness and irrelevance of most of what passes for "educational research." When that study is finally done, the popular dissatisfaction with teachers will become wonder--wonder that teachers have done as well as they have.

Or consider this story, told by Ann Lieberman (1987, p. 404) about researchers who consider their professional perspectives the only truth.

> I once introduced a doctoral student to AERA [the American Educational Research Association] as a means of expanding her horizons. After four days of sessions she remarked to me, "I believe that if all the schools in America sank in the Pacific Ocean, AERA members wouldn't even blink."

To illustrate that this kind of tunnel vision operates in the field of teacher education as well as research, consider the university faculty member who responded to an educational reform proposal in this way (Loadman, Brookhart, & Wongwanich, 1988, p. 5). The teacher educator wrote, "If professional development schools are to be effective, university staff must have some power/authority over teachers and program."

Achieving parity among school and university participants has been one of the difficulties of the Massachusetts Coalition for School Improvement. This coalition teams twenty-six schools and the University of Massachusetts to work on various projects. Despite a stated commitment to the premise of teacher, administrator, and professor involvement and interaction for the service of students, the Coalition has had trouble moving university people from the view that they should research findings and develop programs and that schools should implement and consume them (Sinclair & Harrison, 1988). Heckman (1988) reported similar difficulties with the Southern California Partnership, between UCLA and several southern California schools. He noted that matching a project with a university professor's research interest was a useful strategy.

There is evidence that participation in collaboration can give professionals from each culture more insights into the other's world and

help reduce the propensity for tunnel vision. The collaborative model was developed in part to change the focus of educational efforts from the linear research and development model, in which teachers are practitioners who take their directions from theorists, to a model in which theory and practice together inform what research is done (Tikunoff, Ward, & Griffin, 1979).

The development of a collaborative model to inform research does not mean that the insights of teachers are better or any more right than the insights of researchers simply because they are closer to the classroom. The two perspectives are different, and using both allows for a richer understanding of educational issues (Hering & Howey, 1982). Teachers contribute subjective understanding of particular contexts: the insider view. University researchers contribute the outsider perspective and a broader context into which to fit the particular ones. Hering and Howey's report includes some inspiring and enthusiastic quotes from members of both groups testifying to their personal and professional growth because of interactions between the two cultures.

These benefits for university educators and public school teachers and administrators who have participated in collaborative efforts, in the form of increased understanding and mutual appreciation of each other's perspectives and work focus, are often touted. Williams and Harris (1984) found one benefit of school-university exchange teaching programs was that university people liked to hear from people working in the public schools. In the San Diego IR&DT project described above, the team reported that participation in the project changed their views of educational research. Teachers reported seeing more validity and usable results from research done collaboratively than traditionally and reported

being more willing to change their classroom practices because of such results. Researchers reported becoming committed to a team approach and to the importance of considering development issues from the start (Tikunoff, Ward, & Lazar, 1980).

One of the oldest formal school-university partnerships is the Metropolitan School Study Council at Teachers College, Columbia University, in New York City. Lieberman reported one of the learnings and benefits over the years has been the power of doing something together. People from two cultures create a "culture of collaboration" when they set aside stereotypes and work together (Lieberman, 1988, p. 84).

Porter's conclusion about the results of collaborative research, based on the IRT activities at Michigan State University, echoed this theme of researchers and teachers both broadening their perspectives. He cited not only personal growth, but also improved professional practice. Researchers who collaborated improved their research questions, interpretation of results, and external validity of designs. Teachers who collaborated became more analytical and more willing to apply new ideas (Porter, 1987). These gains in validity, broadening of perspective, and appreciation for the culture of both the university and the public school were the results of collaboration for teacher education, too (Szekely, 1981, p. 133).

A broader focus for school principals and university staff happened as a result of a collaborative University of Pennsylvania doctoral program for practicing school administrators. The Philadelphia principals and the university faculty did not always agree, but the result of the program included greater perceived university interest in schools and greater principal interest in research and program change (Botel, Glatthorn, &

Larkin, 1984).

Where an educator sees himself or herself on the theory/practice continuum, how connected he or she feels to the classroom, and what he or she perceives as the immediate purpose or focus of his or her work consitute an important professional perspective. There is evidence to support that teachers, administrators, and researchers perceive themselves differently on this dimension. There is also evidence that these perceptions are important to the kind of organic collaboration projects which are advocated presently and growing in number. As the dean of the Brigham Young University College of Education, reflecting on the BYU-Public School Partnership, said, "We didn't realize how different we really were!" (Williams, 1988, p. 139).

Career Reward Structure

For schoolteachers, the primary reward for their work is working with children, "reaching" them, and seeing them learn (Lortie, 1975; Kottkamp, Provenzo, & Cohn, 1986; Loadman, Brookhart, & Wongwanich, 1988). Lieberman and Miller (1979, 1984) see this as one of the most basic parts of "the social realities of teaching."

There are other rewards in teaching. Lortie (1975) categorized extrinsic, ancillary, and psychic or intrinsic rewards of teaching. Extrinsic rewards are objective ones, like salary, which apply to all teachers. Ancillary rewards are objective but subjective in their judgments as rewards. For example, the summer "off" might be more of a reward to a parent with small children than to a childless person. Psychic or intrinsic rewards are subjective; they differ from person to person. Intrinsic rewards are things which are rewarding because of their

subjective value. For example, if one values education, then helping a child learn is rewarding in itself. Schoolteachers in 1964 and in 1984 perceived the intrinsic rewards of teaching as far more important than extrinsic or ancillary rewards (Kottkamp, Provenzo, & Cohn, 1986). Teachers can hold this view at the same time as they also feel that teachers' salaries are too low (Loadman, Brookhart, & Wongwanich, 1988).

The university reward structure is very different from the public school reward structure. University rewards come in the form of publication, recognition in an academic field, and academic rank. Among university faculty, working in the public schools is often held in low esteem. The amount of time such field work takes is frequently unappreciated (Lieberman, 1980, 1987). Research universities rarely reward field work to the same degree as they reward more traditional research (Lieberman, 1987). Once field work is completed, the opportunities for publishing the results are not good (Reynolds, 1980). Practitioners' magazines are not as prestigious as research journals.

Tenure at a research university "would be hard to come by for assistant professors engaging in long-term, unpredictable, research projects" (Heckman, 1988, p. 119) such as those in the Southern California Partnership. The result in this case was that all active Partnership faculty were associate or full professors. Gifford (1986) noted that incentive systems in the two cultures conflict and do not encourage collaboration.

Differences in how teachers and university people perceive the reward structures for their careers do not necessarily mean that they cannot work together. But without an awareness of the differences, they may be expecting different things from projects without realizing it. The

teachers who participate in collaborative research may not know what kind of rewards to expect from research, and may not even perceive them as rewards (Hering & Howey, 1982, p. 66).

McLaughlin and Marsh (1978) reported that in the Rand corporation's major study of federal programs supporting educational change (Berman & McLaughlin, 1975, 1977), complicated projects requiring more effort and ambition inspired more teacher commitment. McLaughlin and Marsh saw this as evidence that teachers' beliefs that they would teach better and that their students would learn better were motivating. Such improvements were potential rewards teachers considered worthwhile.

Little (1988) reported a study to assess prospects for teacher leadership. She found teachers only hesitantly approved of a more public and assertive role a master teacher might play. The particular school's history of teacher initiatives made a difference in responses. There was ambiguity in principals' responses, too, as to how much teacher initiative in program and instructional policy would be accepted and rewarded.

Keating and Clark (1988) examined the experience of the Puget Sound Educational Consortium, a partnership among nine school districts and the University of Washington College of Education. They saw the question of rewards for participation in collaboration as a yet unresolved issue. University people tended to continue their customary research methods, not adapting them very much to the context of a partnership, so that they could still publish. Administrators and teachers tended to be personally pleased to work with the projects, but recognition in their school districts was not very noticeable. Each culture was still operating with its own reward structure.

Sense of Personal Power and Efficacy

The Rand Change Agent study, cited above, has alerted educators to the importance of teacher efficacy in supporting educational change (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978). Efficacy has since been studied as a teacher characteristic related to student outcome measures and classroom atmosphere (Ashton, 1984) and teacher change (Smylie, 1988).

It is clear, then, that sense of efficacy is an important variable in teachers' perceptions of themselves at work. Lieberman and Miller (1979) noted that teachers often do not feel they have the control they would like to have. In their own classrooms, they have a limited amount of control, based partly on their relationships with their students. The farther from the classroom they get, the less control they have, in the building or the district, for example. Teachers' lack of confidence in the efficacy of their own teaching contributes to the privacy rule described below.

Lieberman and Miller's concept of the dailiness of teaching includes a category they label "rules." The two rules teachers use in their daily work are "be practical" and "be private." Practicality in this sense means placing a value on strategies which are immediately transferrable into classroom activity. Immediate, concrete solutions to problems of discipline, order, or achievement, which require no resources beyond those at hand and are not much extra work, are practical. Being private extends practicality into the personal sphere. It is not practical to share with other teachers one's daily experiences or perceptions as a teacher. While this principle means teachers cannot glory in their successes, it also protects them from being found out in their failures (Lieberman & Miller, 1979, 1984). Practicality and privacy rules reinforce the circumstances

of public school teaching, in which the teacher is often the sole adult in a room filled with children. The entrance of another adult into the room, or an adult voice on the public address system, can be an intrusion into the practical, private world of the classroom.

University faculty have been observed to be private, as well, but the nature of this privacy is not the same as it is for public school personnel. The organizational culture of a teacher education institution emphasizes individual professional accomplishments over the goals of the institution (Clark & Guba, 1977). Professors are then expected, however, to share these private accomplishments outside the institution, by publishing.

Darling-Hammond (1987) noted the inconsistency in holding teachers professionally accountable for meeting the needs of their students and at the same time defining "professional" teaching behavior as that which is in strict compliance with state directives, courses of study, and curriculum guides. Teachers in Texas often perceive that policy makers and reformers "see them as static, unimaginative, unthinking and uninspired dolts" (Brackenridge Forum, 1988, p. 9) as teachers increasingly are told to standardize both their own practices and student outcomes.

Indeed, Cooper (1988, p. 50) pointed out, talk of teacher "empowerment" highlights the fact that teachers are "political subjects and philosophical objects." If they must be empowered, passive voice, then they can have their power removed as well, by the same authorities who delegated power. Power comes as a result of professionalism; power does not create professionalism (Cooper, 1988). Schlechty (1988), however, argued for just such a reassignment of authority to teachers in

order for significant changes to take place. He used as an example the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools Teacher Career Development Program. This career ladder program was collaborative in intent but top-down in its management of change.

In comparison with teachers, university educators have "the power and status that come with experience and expert knowledge" (Buchmann, 1985). Davies and Aquino (1975) pointed out that when two or more groups get together to collaborate, there is a natural tendency for groups to want to keep what power and status they have. University people are not overbearing bullies; they simply have traditionally more power and status than classroom teachers do (Boyer, 1982).

There is evidence that feelings of shared power and increased professionalism can result from collaboration. Members of both the university and public school cultures have noted this effect. University faculty at the University of California at Berkeley reported greater feelings of collegiality and being part of a larger profession as a result of participation in the School University Partnership for Educational Renewal (Gifford, 1986). Classroom teachers have reported an increase in feelings of professional competence as a result of collaboration for research (Porter, 1987). This perception has also been expressed as heightened teacher self-esteem (Gifford, 1986; Lieberman & Miller, 1984). Collaboration for staff development has also been observed to lead to heightened self-esteem. Teacher participants in the Southwest Texas Program for Improving Basic Skills Instruction in the Secondary Schools reported an enhanced sense of professionalism, partly because they felt they were treated as professionals (Parkay, 1986).

Collaboration for curriculum reform has also resulted in an increased

sense of efficacy for classroom teachers. Lampert (1988) reported teachers' feelings of self-confidence and professionalism after they participated in a collaborative project to develop mathematics curriculum and pedagogy.

How an educator perceives his or her own power and efficacy is thus an important dimension of his or her professional perceptions. There is evidence in the literature reviewed that the dimension of power and personal effectiveness is an important dimension to consider. Evidence was also reviewed that supported an increase in feelings of professional competence for teachers who worked collaboratively with university faculty.

Conclusions

Universities and public schools are both part of the educational community. The purpose of both institutions is education and understanding, and the heart of both institutions is the professional educators who work in them. An increasingly holistic view of what education should be has informed and inspired a wave of projects, most of them in the last decade, in which educators work across institutions to add depth and scope to their work. Collaboration is an idea whose time has come.

This synthesis of literature on the nature of universities and public schools, and especially literature on the results of collaborative projects, has identified cultural differences among educators. There are four prominent dimensions on which university and public school educators differ. These are (1) work tempo, (2) professional focus, (3) career reward structure, and (4) sense of personal power and efficacy. There is

evidence that orientations along these dimensions are important considerations when educators from the two cultures work together.

There is also evidence that participation in collaborative projects, for research or preservice or inservice teacher education, brings professional growth in the form of increased understanding along these dimensions. Lack of growth on these dimensions, for example lack of trust or the persistence of status differences, are frequently reported as impediments to collaboration.

It is the thesis of this paper that collaboration is a personalized strategy. It has its roots in the concept that people who are working together in the field of education should, indeed, work together. But those who are likely to be placed in or elect to participate in collaborative activities represent two cultures. This insight must form the base from which successful school-university collaboration, including many of the activities in current proposals for educational reform, may be accomplished. Intercultural understanding implies an appreciation of educators' shared frames of reference or perspectives. This paper has demonstrated there are at least four dimensions, frames of reference, or themes which are salient when the topic is school-university collaboration. Indeed, school-university collaboration is, without question, multicultural education.

REFERENCES

Ashton, P. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A motivational paradigm for effective teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (5), 28-32.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. (1975, April). Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol IV: The findings in review. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation document R-1589/4-HEW.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. (1977, April). Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol VII: Factors affecting implementation and continuation. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation document R-1589/7-HEW.

Botel, M., Glatthorn, A. A., & Larkin, J. M. (1984). Focused graduate studies: A new pattern of school/university cooperation. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 563-564.

Boyer, E. (1982). A conversation with Ernest Boyer. Change, 14, 18-21.

Brackenridge Forum for the Enhancement of Teaching. (1988). Teachers speak: Quality schooling for Texas today and tomorrow. San Antonio: Trinity University.

Breinin, C. M. (1987). A complaint and a prediction. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 15-16.

Brookhart, S. M., & Loadman, W. E. (1989, March). Work perceptions of professional educators. San Francisco: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Buchmann, M. (1985). Improving education by talking: argument or conversation? Teachers College Record, 86, 441-453.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation.

Clark, D. L., & Guba, E. G. (1977). A study of teacher education institutions as innovators, knowledge producers, and change agencies. Bloomington: Indiana University. (ED 139 805).

Cooper, M. (1988). Whose culture is it, anyway? In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Building a Professional Culture in Schools. (pp. 45-54). New York: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1987). Teacher "professionalization" versus democratic control. Education Digest, 53, 15-17.

Davies, H. M., & Aquino, J. T. (1975). Collaboration in continuing professional development. Journal of Teacher Education, 26, 274-277.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Floden, R. (1986). The cultures of teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching, Third edition. (pp. 505-526). New York: Macmillan.

Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures. New York: Basic Books.

Gifford, B. R. (1986). The evolution of the School-University Partnership for Educational Renewal. Education and Urban Society, 19, 77-106.

Gifford, B. R., & Gabelko, N. H. (1987). Linking practice-sensitive researchers to research-sensitive practitioners. Education and Urban Society, 19, 368-388.

Glickman, C. D. (1988). Supervision and the rhetoric of empowerment: Silence or collision? Unpublished paper, University of Georgia.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Goodlad, J. I. (1988). School-university partnerships for educational renewal: Rationale and concepts. In K. A. Sirotnik & J. I. Goodlad (Eds.), School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases, and concerns. (p. 3-31). New York: Teachers College Press.

Griffin, G. A. (1983). Implications of research for staff development programs. The Elementary School Journal, 83, 414-425.

Heathington, B. S., Cagle, L. C., & George, T. W. (1988, February). Classroom teachers as adjunct faculty: Bridging the gap between core courses and field studies. New Orleans: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

Heckman, P. E. (1988). The Southern California Partnership: A retrospective analysis. In K. A. Sirotnik & J. I. Goodlad (Eds.), School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases, and concerns. (p. 106-123). New York: Teachers College Press.

Hering, W. M., & Howey, K. R. (1982). Research in, on, and by teacher centers: Summary report. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. (ED 225 975).

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. East Lansing: Michigan State University.

Hord, S. M. (1986). A synthesis of research on organizational collaboration. Educational Leadership, 43(6), 22-26.

Houston, W. R. (1980). Collaboration--See "treason". In G. E. Hall, S. M. Hord, & G. Brown (Eds.) Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research (pp. 429-448). The University of Texas at Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Keating, P. J., & Clark, R. W. (1988). Accent on leadership: The Puget Sound Educational Consortium. In K. A. Sirotnik & J. I. Goodlad (Eds.), School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases, and concerns. (p. 148-166). New York: Teachers College Press.

Kottkamp, R. B., Provenzo, E. F., & Cohn, M. M. (1986). Stability and change in a profession: Two decades of teacher attitudes, 1964-1984. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 559-567.

Lampert. M. (1988, April). School/university collaboration in developing mathematical pedagogy. New Orleans: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Lieberman, A. (1980). Describers and improvers: People, processes and problems. In G. E. Hall, S. M. Hord, & G. Brown (Eds.) Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research (pp. 415-428). The University of Texas at Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Lieberman, A. (1987). Teacher leadership. Teachers College Record, 88, 400-405.

Lieberman, A. (1988). The Metropolitan School Study Council: A living history. In K. A. Sirotnik & J. I. Goodlad (Eds.), School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases, and concerns. (p. 69-86). New York: Teachers College Press.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1979). The social realities of teaching. In A. Lieberman & L. Miller, (Eds.) Staff development: New demands, new realities, new perspectives (pp. 54-68). New York: Teachers College Press.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1984). Teachers, their world, and their work. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Little, J. W. (1988). Assissing the prospects for teacher leadership. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Building a Professional Culture in Schools. (pp. 78-106). New York: Teachers College Press.

Loadman, W. E., Brookhart, S. M., & Wongwanich, S. (1988, April). Perceptions and attitudes about teaching and teacher education. New Orleans: paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McLaughlin, M. W., & Marsh, D. D. (1978). Staff development and school change. Teachers College Record, 80, 69-94.

Maeroff, G. I. (1983). School and college partnerships in education. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Mitchell, D. E., Ortiz, F. I., & Mitchell, T. K. (1987). Work orientation and job performance: The cultural basis of teaching rewards and incentives. Albany: State University of New York Press.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983, April). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Governors' Association. (1986). Time for results: The governors' 1991 report on education. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association, Center for Policy Research and Analysis.

Nur, M. M. (1983). University-district collaboration for promoting change in curriculum and classroom practices. Theory into Practice, 22, 224-230.

Parkay, F. W. (1986). A school/university partnership that fosters inquiry-oriented staff development. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 386-389.

Pipho, C. (1986). KAPPAN special report: States mover reform closer to reality. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(4), K1-K8.

Porter, A. C. (1987). Teacher collaboration: New partnerships to attack old problems. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 147-152.

Reynolds, M. C. (1980). Networks of teacher educators: An approach to Public Law 94-142. In G. E. Hall, S. M. Hord, & G. Brown (Eds.) Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research (pp. 449-462). The University of Texas at Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Sarason, S. B. (1982). The culture of the school and the problem of change, second edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Sarason, S. B. (1988). Time perspective and institutional change. Unpublished paper, Yale University.

Schlechty, P. C. (1988). Leading cultural change: The CMS case. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Building a Professional Culture in Schools. (pp. 185-221). New York: Teachers College Press.

Schlechty, P. C., & Whitford, B. L. (1988). Types and characteristics of school-university collaboration. Kappa Delta Pi Record, 24, 81-83.

Schlechty, P. C., & Whitford, B. L. (1988). Shared problems and shared vision: Organic collaboration. In K. A. Sirotnik & J. I. Goodlad (Eds.), School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases, and concerns. (p. 191-204). New York, Teachers College Press.

Sinclair, R. L., & Harrison, A. E. (1988). A partnership for increasing student learning: The Massachusetts Coalition for School Improvement. In K. A. Sirotnik & J. I. Goodlad (Eds.), School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases, and concerns. (p. 87-105). New York, Teachers College Press.

Sizer, T. R. (1988). Dailiness. Educational Researcher, 17(3), 5.

Smylie, M. A. (1988). The enhancement function of staff development: Organizational and psychological antecedents to individual teacher change. American Educational Research Journal, 25, 1-30.

Sparks, G. M., Moody, C. & Johnson, R. (1988, February). The teacher as mentor in a large pre-student teaching program. New Orleans: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

Stallings, J. A., & Martin, A. (1988, April). Houston Teaching Academy: A professional development school. New Orleans: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Szekely, G. (1981). Adopt-a-school project: Art educators in residence. Improving College and University Teaching, 29, 129-133.

Tikunoff, W. J., Ward, B. A., & Griffin, G. A. (1979). Interactive Research and Development on Teaching: Executive Summary. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. (ED 186386).

Tikunoff, W. J., & Ward, B. A. (1983). Collaborative research on teaching. The Elementary School Journal, 83, 453-468.

Tikunoff, W. J., Ward, B. A., & Lazar, C. (1980). Partners: Teachers, researchers, trainer/developers--An interactive approach to teacher education R & D. In G. E. Hall, S. M. Hord, & G. Brown (Eds.) Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research (pp. 357-382). The University of Texas at Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Williams, D. D. (1988). The Brigham Young University-Public School Partnership. In K. A. Sirotnik & J. I. Goodlad (Eds.), School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases, and concerns. (p. 124-147). New York, Teachers College Press.

Williams, P., & Harris, C. (1984). Who's the new teacher in room 224? Developing a partnership in teacher education. Clearinghouse, 57, 258-260.